

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/075,615	02/15/2002	Joseph C. Cauthen III	8442.0002-02	· 2841	
22852 7590 07/12/2007 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			EXAMINER		
			ISABELLA, DAVID J		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	11, DC 20001-4-115	•	3738		
			,	•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
	4		07/12/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

					λ
Office Action Summary		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/075,	615	CAUTHEN, JOSE	ЕРН С.
		Examin	er	Art Unit	
		DAVID	J. ISABELLA	3738	
The Period for Rep	MAILING DATE of this communi	cation appears on t	he cover sheet wi	th the correspondence a	ddress
WHICHEVE - Extensions or after SIX (6) - If NO period to - Failure to rep Any reply rec	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR IS LONGER, FROM THE MARKET IS LONGER IN THE MARKET	AILING DATE OF 7 of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no cunication. tutory period will apply and will, by statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUNIC event, however, may a re will expire SIX (6) MON pplication to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·
Status					
2a) ☐ This a	onsive to communication(s) filed action is FINAL . 2 this application is in condition for d in accordance with the practic	b)⊠ This action is for allowance excep	ot for formal matt	• •	e merits is
Disposition of	Claims				
4a) O 5) ☐ Claim 6) ☑ Claim 7) ☑ Claim 8) ☐ Claim Application Pa 9) ☐ The s 10) ☐ The d Application Repla	f the above claim(s) 5,6,8-12 and n(s) is/are allowed. n(s) is/are allowed. n(s) 2,3,7 and 17-21 is/are rejection(s) 1-4,7,17 is/are objected to. n(s) are subject to restrict the rewing(s) filed on is/are: cant may not request that any object cement drawing sheet(s) including ath or declaration is objected to	ted. tion and/or election Examiner. a) accepted or lition to the drawing(s) the correction is requ	drawn from cons requirement. b) objected to be held in abeyand if the drawings	by the Examiner. ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 C	• •
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)	,— ,—	documents have be documents have be of the priority docur nal Bureau (PCT R	een received. een received in A nents have been ule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this Nationa	l Stage
2) Notice of Dragon Notice of Dragon	ferences Cited (PTO-892) aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P ⁻ Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) /Mail Date	ГО-948)	Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application 	

Art Unit: 3738

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Species 1, i.e. figure 1 in the reply filed on 4/27/2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) as set forth in 37CFR 1.146 and according to MPEP § 808.01(a), election of species may be required prior to a search on the merits ... in applications containing both species claims and generic or Markush claims. Applicants respectfully submit that a search of the subject matter of all alleged species would not impose an additional burden on the Examiner. Indeed, the subject matter has already been searched, and Official Actions on the merits were previously mailed on the claims on August 29, 2003, June 3, 2004, August 24, 2005, and March 6, 2006. It is not clear how, after four substantive actions, the claims now present an undue burden on the Examiner.

This is not found persuasive because there is nothing in MPEP section 808.01(a) and rule 37CFR1.146 that prohibits the examiner from making a restriction to various species. It is not clear what portion of rule 37CFR1.146 limits restriction to species to only occur in the first action on an application containing a generic claims. Clearly the species in each of figure 1; figure 4A;4B;4C;5A,B;6A, B;10A,B;13,18A, B;19A,b; and 21 are distinctly different and have different mechanisms of function. The simple device as illustrated in figure 1 is limited physically limited to a membrane-like device with a central reinforcing extension. The device as illustrated in figure 5A includes a membrane-like component to which a bladder is attached thereto. The in vivo mode of operation between the two devices differs and the devices are structurally

different and distinct. The device as illustrated in figure 18A is similar to function as that of figure 1 however the there is no structural similarities between the two devices.

Likewise, the device of figure 21 is similar in operation as that of figure 5A however it is

structurally similar to the device of figure 18A and not figure 5A. Since the structure of the devices are structurally distinct and have operational mode unique to the structure though they all provide similar function, the restriction to the species is proper. In so far as serious burden on the examiner, any additional features which must be considered and searched the features are not required in all the species, a serious burden is placed on the examiner.

Claims 5,6,8-16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 4/27/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2,3,7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2 and 3 are indefinite. Claim 2 recites that the "inside edge joins said centralized vertical extension to form a substantially horizontal plane". It is not clear how the edge forms a horizontal plane with the extension. It appears that the extension, ie. surfaces may be joined with the extension and one or both surfaces are joined to the extension such that the surface(s) and some feature of the extension either delineate or lie in some plane.

With respect to claim 3, the angular range of "0-60" degrees does not appear to encompass the definition of "horizontal plane". (i.e. deviation of 60 degrees from a horizontal line would not be defined as a horizontal plane.

Claim 7 is not grammatically correct. (i.e. a recess wherein said upper surface joins said centralized vertical)

Claim 17 is inaccurate. The shape should be defined according to a crosssection of the elongated extension.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 21,18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schmidt et al [5290217].

Schmidt et al discloses a therapeutic device providing a device comprising a biocompatible material such that said material forms a bridge providing a platform for a traverse of fibroblasts or other normal cells of repair existing in and around the various layers tissue and the device having means for acute securement of said device to said disc annulus (i.e. sutures, staples, etc). While Schmidt et al is silent to the repair vertebral tissue by the placement of the device in and across an aperture in the intervertebral disc wall, the device of Schmidt is capable of placement and function in the intervertebral disc wall.

Claims 18-20, the device of Schmidt et al is a fiber mesh that is bioabsorbable and has properties that facilitates regeneration of new tissues.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1,2,3,4,7 and 17 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID J. ISABELLA whose telephone number is 571-272-4749. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-FRIDAY.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CORRINE MCDERMOTT can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone

Art Unit: 3738

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

> DAYUD JISABELLA Primary Examiner Art Unit 3738

DJI 7/1/2007